## REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 21-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, 21, and 28 are amended. This Amendment is supported by the specification at at least Fig. 5 and a paragraph [0028].

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Bengzon at the personal interview held on February 24, 2009 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

### I. Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, 14-18, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,192) in view of Bishop (U.S. Patent No. 4,914,653); claims 12, 13, 19, and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan in view of Bishop and further in view of Balachandran (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0078620). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Narasimhan, Bishop, and Balachandran, either alone or in combinations, do not disclose or suggest a management port having at least a management block including a manageability control module, the manageability control module configured to apply a protocol for communicating over a microprocessor bus system, and the manageability control module configured to provide access for allowing another microprocessor subsystem to perform a management function even when the processor core is not responsive, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 8, 15, 19, and 28.

The Office Action, on page 4, asserts that Narasimhan discloses a management block (see Figs. 7 and 9 of Narasimhan). Narasimhan teaches a network interface chip (NIC) having a

command processor, which receives and transmits data including commands and results. (See col. 13, lines 42-49 of Narasimhan). Narasimhan does not teach or render obvious the management block including a manageability control module configured to apply a protocol for communicating over the microprocessor bus system, and configured to provide access for allowing another microprocessor subsystem to perform the management function even when the processor core is not responsive. Further, the Office Action asserts that Bishop discloses inter-processor communication and using logic channels (see col. 6, lines 55-65 of Bishop); and Balachandran discloses a substantially omni-directional antenna connected to the embedded communications microprocessor system (see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0008] of Balachandran). Therefore, Bishop and Balachandran, either alone or in combinations, do not cure the above-noted deficiency of Narasimhan.

In view of the above, Narasimhan, Bishop, and Balachandran, either alone or in combinations, do not disclose or render obvious at least the management block including a manageability control module, the manageability control module configured to apply a protocol for communicating over the microprocessor bus system, and the manageability control module configured to provide access for allowing another microprocessor subsystem to perform the management function even when the processor core is not responsive, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 8, 15, 19, and 28.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19, and 28 are allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1; claims 9-14 depend from claim 8; claims 16-18 depend from claim 15; claims 21-27 depend from claim 19; and claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 21-27, 29, and 30 are therefore also allowable by virtue of their dependence, as well as for the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

## II. **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-19 and 21-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Andy N. Kim
Registration No. 61,050

JAO:ANK/rle

Date: March 3, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**
**P.O. Box 320850**
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461